



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/723,200	11/27/2000	Walid R. Tout	27751/04006	5193

7590 05/04/2004

IDN Technologies LLC  
c/o General Patent Corporation International  
75 Montebello Road  
Suffern, NJ 10901

EXAMINER
----------

TRAN, PHILIP B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

DATE MAILED: 05/04/2004

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application N . 09/723,200	Applicant(s) TOUT, WALID R.	
	Examiner Philip B Tran	Art Unit 2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 18-93 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 18-93 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Objections*

1. The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not).

Misnumbered claims 80-93 should have been renumbered as 79-92, respectively.

Appropriate corrections are required.

2. Claims 19-20 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 19, line 2, "second domain name" should be "noncompliant domain name".

Claim 20, line 2, "second domain name" should be "noncompliant domain name".

Claim 29, line 8, item reference character "(c)" should be restored.

Claim 41, line 2, "second domain name" should be "noncompliant domain name".

Claim 42, line 2, "second domain name" should be "noncompliant domain name".

Claim 44, line 2, "second domain name" should be "noncompliant domain name".

Claim 48, line 2, "second domain name" should be "noncompliant domain name".

Claim 49, line 2, "second domain name" should be "noncompliant domain name".

Appropriate corrections are required.

***Doubl Patenting***

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 18-93 of the instant application is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over some claims of Tout, U.S. Patent No. 6,182,148 in view of Tan et al (Hereafter, Tan), U.S. Patent No. 6,314,469. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because modifications are obvious.

Regarding claim 18, claims 1 and 2 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 18 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10]. It does not explicitly teach the domain name resides under a dot root. However, Tan, in the same field of internationalized domain name endeavor, discloses the domain name resides under a dot root [see Tan, Fig. 6 and Col. 16, Lines 64-67]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the domain name residing under a dot root, disclosed by Tan, into the system of internationalized domain name disclosed by Tout, because it would have enabled the system to classify domain names into different levels and groups which would enhance to search for a match of domain names during resolving process in a quicker and more efficient manner.

Regarding claim 19, claims 1-2 and 8-10 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 19 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10 and Col. 10, Lines 41-50].

Regarding claim 20, claims 1-2 and 8-10 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 20 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10 and Col. 10, Lines 41-50].

Regarding claim 21, claims 1 and 7 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 21 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10 and Col. 10, Lines 35-40].

Regarding claim 22, claim 1 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 22 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10].

Regarding claim 23, claim 11 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 23 [see Col. 10, Line 51 to Col. 11, Line 5].

Regarding claim 24, claim 11 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 24 [see Col. 10, Line 51 to Col. 11, Line 5].

Regarding claim 25, claim 11 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 25 [see Col. 10, Line 51 to Col. 11, Line 5].

Regarding claim 26, claim 11 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 26 [see Col. 10, Line 51 to Col. 11, Line 5].

Regarding claim 27, claim 11 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 27 [see Col. 10, Line 51 to Col. 11, Line 5].

Regarding claim 28, claims 11 and 12 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 28 [see Col. 10, Line 51 to Col. 11, Line 12].

Regarding claim 29, claims 1 and 2 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 29 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10]. It does not explicitly teach the domain name resides under a dot root. However, Tan, in the same field of

internationalized domain name endeavor, discloses the domain name resides under a dot root [see Tan, Fig. 6 and Col. 16, Lines 64-67]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the domain name residing under a dot root, disclosed by Tan, into the system of internationalized domain name disclosed by Tout, because it would have enabled the system to classify domain names into different levels and groups which would enhance to search for a match of domain names during resolving process in a quicker and more efficient manner.

Regarding claim 30, claims 1-2 and 8-10 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 30 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10 and Col. 10, Lines 41-50].

Regarding claim 31, claims 1-2 and 8-10 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 31 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10 and Col. 10, Lines 41-50].

Regarding claim 32, claims 1 and 7 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 32 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10 and Col. 10, Lines 35-40].

Regarding claim 33, claim 1 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 33 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10].

Regarding claim 34, claim 11 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 34 [see Col. 10, Line 51 to Col. 11, Line 5].

Regarding claim 35, claim 11 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 35 [see Col. 10, Line 51 to Col. 11, Line 5].

Regarding claim 36, claim 11 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 36 [see Col. 10, Line 51 to Col. 11, Line 5].

Regarding claim 37, claim 11 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 37 [see Col. 10, Line 51 to Col. 11, Line 5].

Regarding claim 38, claim 11 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 38 [see Col. 10, Line 51 to Col. 11, Line 5].

Regarding claim 39, claims 11 and 12 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 39 [see Col. 10, Line 51 to Col. 11, Line 12].

Regarding claim 40, claims 1 and 2 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 40 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10]. It does not explicitly teach the domain name resides under a dot root. However, Tan, in the same field of internationalized domain name endeavor, discloses the domain name resides under a



dot root [see Tan, Fig. 6 and Col. 16, Lines 64-67]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the domain name residing under a dot root, disclosed by Tan, into the system of internationalized domain name disclosed by Tout, because it would have enabled the system to classify domain names into different levels and groups which would enhance to search for a match of domain names during resolving process in a quicker and more efficient manner.

Regarding claim 41, claims 1-2 and 8-10 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 41 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10 and Col. 10, Lines 41-50].

Regarding claim 42, claims 1-2 and 8-10 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 42 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10 and Col. 10, Lines 41-50].

Regarding claim 43, claims 1 and 2 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 43 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10]. It does not explicitly teach the domain name resides under a dot root. However, Tan, in the same field of internationalized domain name endeavor, discloses the domain name resides under a dot root [see Tan, Fig. 6 and Col. 16, Lines 64-67]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the domain name residing under a dot root, disclosed by Tan, into the system of internationalized domain name disclosed by Tout, because it would have enabled the system to classify

domain names into different levels and groups which would enhance to search for a match of domain names during resolving process in a quicker and more efficient manner.

Regarding claim 44, claims 1-2 and 8-10 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 44 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10 and Col. 10, Lines 41-50].

Regarding claim 45, claim 11 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 45 [see Col. 10, Line 51 to Col. 11, Line 5].

Regarding claim 46, claim 12 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 46 [see Col. 11, Lines 6-12].

Regarding claim 47, claims 1 and 2 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 47 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10]. It does not explicitly teach the domain name resides under a dot root. However, Tan, in the same field of internationalized domain name endeavor, discloses the domain name resides under a dot root [see Tan, Fig. 6 and Col. 16, Lines 64-67]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the domain name residing under a dot root, disclosed by Tan, into the system of internationalized domain name disclosed by Tout, because it would have enabled the system to classify domain names into different levels and groups which would enhance to search for a

match of domain names during resolving process in a quicker and more efficient manner.

Regarding claim 48, claims 1-2 and 8-10 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 48 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10 and Col. 10, Lines 41-50].

Regarding claim 49, claims 2-3 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 44 [see Col. 10, Lines 7-17].

Regarding claim 50, claims 1 and 2 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 50 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10]. It does not explicitly teach the domain name resides under a dot root. However, Tan, in the same field of internationalized domain name endeavor, discloses the domain name resides under a dot root [see Tan, Fig. 6 and Col. 16, Lines 64-67]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the domain name residing under a dot root, disclosed by Tan, into the system of internationalized domain name disclosed by Tout, because it would have enabled the system to classify domain names into different levels and groups which would enhance to search for a match of domain names during resolving process in a quicker and more efficient manner.

Regarding claim 51, claims 1-2 and 8-10 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 51 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10 and Col. 10, Lines 41-50].

Regarding claim 52, claims 2-3 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 52 [see Col. 10, Lines 7-17].

Regarding claim 53, claims 1-3 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 53 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 17]. It does not explicitly teach the domain name resides under a dot root. However, Tan, in the same field of internationalized domain name endeavor, discloses the domain name resides under a dot root [see Tan, Fig. 6 and Col. 16, Lines 64-67]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the domain name residing under a dot root, disclosed by Tan, into the system of internationalized domain name disclosed by Tout, because it would have enabled the system to classify domain names into different levels and groups which would enhance to search for a match of domain names during resolving process in a quicker and more efficient manner.

Regarding claim 54, claims 1-2 and 8-10 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 54 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10 and Col. 10, Lines 41-50].

Regarding claim 55, claim 11 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 51 [see Col. 10, Line 51 to Col. 11, Line 5].

Regarding claim 56, claims 1 and 2 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 56 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10]. It does not explicitly teach the domain name resides under a dot root. However, Tan, in the same field of internationalized domain name endeavor, discloses the domain name resides under a dot root [see Tan, Fig. 6 and Col. 16, Lines 64-67]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the domain name residing under a dot root, disclosed by Tan, into the system of internationalized domain name disclosed by Tout, because it would have enabled the system to classify domain names into different levels and groups which would enhance to search for a match of domain names during resolving process in a quicker and more efficient manner.

Regarding claim 57, claims 1-2 and 6-7 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 57 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10 and Col. 10, Lines 29-40].

Regarding claim 58, claims 1-2 and 9 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 58 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10 and Col. 10, Lines 44-46].

Regarding claim 59, claims 1 and 2 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 59 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10]. It does not explicitly teach the domain name resides under a dot root. However, Tan, in the same field of internationalized domain name endeavor, discloses the domain name resides under a

dot root [see Tan, Fig. 6 and Col. 16, Lines 64-67]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the domain name residing under a dot root, disclosed by Tan, into the system of internationalized domain name disclosed by Tout, because it would have enabled the system to classify domain names into different levels and groups which would enhance to search for a match of domain names during resolving process in a quicker and more efficient manner.

Regarding claim 60, claims 1-2 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 60 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10].

Regarding claim 61, claims 1-2 and 9 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 61 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10 and Col. 10, Lines 44-46].

Regarding claim 62, claims 1 and 2 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 62 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10]. It does not explicitly teach the domain name resides under a dot root. However, Tan, in the same field of internationalized domain name endeavor, discloses the domain name resides under a dot root [see Tan, Fig. 6 and Col. 16, Lines 64-67]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the domain name residing under a dot root, disclosed by Tan, into the system of internationalized domain name disclosed by Tout, because it would have enabled the system to classify

domain names into different levels and groups which would enhance to search for a match of domain names during resolving process in a quicker and more efficient manner.

Regarding claim 63, claims 1-2 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 63 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10].

Regarding claim 64, claims 1-2 and 9 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 64 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10 and Col. 10, Lines 44-46].

Regarding claim 65, claims 1-2 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 65 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10].

Regarding claim 66, claims 1 and 2 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 66 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10]. It does not explicitly teach the domain name resides under a dot root. However, Tan, in the same field of internationalized domain name endeavor, discloses the domain name resides under a dot root [see Tan, Fig. 6 and Col. 16, Lines 64-67]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the domain name residing under a dot root, disclosed by Tan, into the system of internationalized domain name disclosed by Tout, because it would have enabled the system to classify domain names into different levels and groups which would enhance to search for a

match of domain names during resolving process in a quicker and more efficient manner.

Regarding claim 67, claims 1-2 and 8-10 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 67 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10 and Col. 10, Lines 41-50].

Regarding claim 68, claims 1-2 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 68 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10].

Regarding claim 69, claims 1-2 and 8-10 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 69 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10 and Col. 10, Lines 41-50].

Regarding claim 70, claims 1 and 2 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 70 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10]. It does not explicitly teach the domain name resides under a dot root. However, Tan, in the same field of internationalized domain name endeavor, discloses the domain name resides under a dot root [see Tan, Fig. 6 and Col. 16, Lines 64-67]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the domain name residing under a dot root, disclosed by Tan, into the system of internationalized domain name disclosed by Tout, because it would have enabled the system to classify domain names into different levels and groups which would enhance to search for a



match of domain names during resolving process in a quicker and more efficient manner.

Regarding claim 71, claims 1-2 and 8-10 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 71 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10 and Col. 10, Lines 41-50].

Regarding claim 72, claims 1 and 2 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 72 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10]. It does not explicitly teach the domain name resides under a dot root. However, Tan, in the same field of internationalized domain name endeavor, discloses the domain name resides under a dot root [see Tan, Fig. 6 and Col. 16, Lines 64-67]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the domain name residing under a dot root, disclosed by Tan, into the system of internationalized domain name disclosed by Tout, because it would have enabled the system to classify domain names into different levels and groups which would enhance to search for a match of domain names during resolving process in a quicker and more efficient manner.

Regarding claim 73, claims 1-2 and 9 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 73 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10 and Col. 10, Lines 44-46].

Regarding claim 74, claims 1-2 and 9 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 74 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10 and Col. 10, Lines 44-46].

Regarding claim 75, claims 1-2 and 7 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 75 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10 and Col. 10, Lines 35-40].

Regarding claim 76, claims 1-2 and 8-10 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 76 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10 and Col. 10, Lines 41-50].

Regarding claim 77, claims 1-2 and 8-10 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 77 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10 and Col. 10, Lines 41-50].

Regarding claim 78, claims 1 and 2 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 78 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10]. It does not explicitly teach the domain name resides under a dot root. However, Tan, in the same field of internationalized domain name endeavor, discloses the domain name resides under a dot root [see Tan, Fig. 6 and Col. 16, Lines 64-67]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the domain name residing under a dot root, disclosed by Tan, into the system of internationalized domain name disclosed by Tout, because it would have enabled the system to classify domain names into different levels and groups which would enhance to search for a

match of domain names during resolving process in a quicker and more efficient manner.

Regarding claim 80, claim 1 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 80 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 6].

Regarding claim 81, claim 1 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 81 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 6].

Regarding claim 82, claims 1-2 and 8-10 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 82 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10 and Col. 10, Lines 41-50]. It does not explicitly teach the domain name resides under a dot root. However, Tan, in the same field of internationalized domain name endeavor, discloses the domain name resides under a dot root [see Tan, Fig. 6 and Col. 16, Lines 64-67]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the domain name residing under a dot root, disclosed by Tan, into the system of internationalized domain name disclosed by Tout, because it would have enabled the system to classify domain names into different levels and groups which would enhance to search for a match of domain names during resolving process in a quicker and more efficient manner.

Regarding claim 83, claims 1-2 and 8-10 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 83 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10 and Col. 10, Lines 41-50]. It does not explicitly teach the domain name resides under a dot root. However, Tan, in the same field of internationalized domain name endeavor, discloses the domain name resides under a dot root [see Tan, Fig. 6 and Col. 16, Lines 64-67]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the domain name residing under a dot root, disclosed by Tan, into the system of internationalized domain name disclosed by Tout, because it would have enabled the system to classify domain names into different levels and groups which would enhance to search for a match of domain names during resolving process in a quicker and more efficient manner.

Regarding claim 84, claims 1-2 and 8-10 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 84 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10 and Col. 10, Lines 41-50].

Regarding claim 85, claims 1-2 and 8-10 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 85 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10 and Col. 10, Lines 41-50].

Regarding claim 86, claims 1-2 and 8-10 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 86 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10 and Col. 10, Lines 41-50].

Regarding claim 87, claims 1-2 and 8-10 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 87 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10 and Col. 10, Lines 41-50].

Regarding claim 88, claims 1-2 and 8-10 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 88 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10 and Col. 10, Lines 41-50].

Regarding claim 89, claims 1-2 and 8-10 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 89 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10 and Col. 10, Lines 41-50].

Regarding claim 90, claims 1-2 and 8-10 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 90 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10 and Col. 10, Lines 41-50].

Regarding claim 91, claims 1-2 and 8-10 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 91 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10 and Col. 10, Lines 41-50].

Regarding claim 92, claims 1-2 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 92 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10].

Regarding claim 93, claims 1-2 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,148 recites all limitations in claim 93 [see Col. 9, Line 60 to Col. 10, Line 10].

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 18-92 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

6. A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS, OR THIRTY DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. FAILURE TO RESPOND WITHIN THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE WILL CAUSE THE APPLICATION TO BECOME ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). EXTENSIONS OF TIME MAY BE OBTAINED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF 37 CAR 1.136(A).

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip Tran whose telephone number is (703) 308-8767. The Group fax phone number is (703) 872-9306.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain T. Alam, can be reached on (703) 308-6662.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

*Philip Tran*

Philip B. Tran  
Art Unit 2155  
April 30, 2004